1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MAYER BROWN LLP DALE J. GIALI (SBN 150382) dgiali@mayerbrown.com KERI E. BORDERS (SBN 194015) kborders@mayerbrown.com REBECCA B. JOHNS (SBN 293989) rjohns@mayerbrown.com 350 South Grand Avenue, 25 th Floor Los Angeles, California 90071 Telephone: (213) 229-9500 Facsimile: (213) 625-0248 Attorneys for Defendant LOGITECH INC.	
8		
9	UNITED STATES DITRICT COURT	
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
12 13	JAMES PORATH, individually on behalf of all others similarly situated individuals,	Case No. 3:18-cv-03091-WHA LOGITECH INC.'S RESPONSE TO
14	Plaintiffs,	PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSAL REGARDING NOTICE TO PUTATIVE
15	V.	CLASS MEMBERS (ECF NO. 84)
16	LOGITECH INC., a California corporation,	Hon. William Alsup
17	Defendant.	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	DEFENDANT LOGITECH INC.'S RESPONSE TO ECF NO. 84 NO. 3:18-CV-03091-WHA	

In the Amended Case Management Scheduling Order (ECF No. 83), the Court ordered plaintiff to submit a proposed notice plan regarding the denial of the motion for class certification and of the potential dismissal of this case. Logitech Inc. takes no position on the propriety of providing notice to putative class members and does not oppose the proposed plan or form of notice submitted by plaintiff's counsel. See ECF Nos. 84, 84-1, 84-2.

Logitech, however, wishes to raise two points relating to the Court's order:

- 1. Logitech and its counsel received no advance notice from plaintiff's counsel that it did not intend to pursue this matter on behalf of a new class representative and were surprised by the December 19, 2019 notice. See ECF No. 82. Logitech and its counsel fully expected plaintiff's counsel to file a renewed class certification motion on behalf of a new class representative and were prepared to respond with a renewed opposition. In fact, Logitech was working with plaintiff's counsel to schedule a date for the new class representative's deposition.
- 2. The December 19, 2019 notice does not disclose whether plaintiff's counsel intends to file a new case (or cases) in another jurisdiction that challenges the Logitech Z200 on the same theory of liability alleged here. Plaintiff's counsel has represented to Logitech that it does not have a present intention to do so. Accordingly, Logitech requests that plaintiff's counsel confirm that representation and that plaintiff's counsel be required to provide notice to the Court if any such subsequent case is filed in another jurisdiction.

Dated: January 13, 2020 MAYER BROWN LLP DALE J. GIALI KERI E. BORDERS REBECCA B. JOHNS

> By: /s/ Dale J. Giali Dale J. Giali Attorneys for Defendant LOGITECH INC.

25

27 28